IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT :

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V.GIRI

WEDNESDAY, THE 21ST NOVEMBER 2007 / 30TH KARTHIKA 1929

WP(C).No. 31289 of 2007(Y)

PETITIONER:

RONISH DAS.C.R.
S/O. C.V.RAMADAS, VADASERIPARAMBIL
HOUSE NO.61/1947, KALOOR, KOCHI-17.

BY ADV. SRI.C.A.CHACKO
SMT.C.M.CHARISMA
SRI.N.A.SHAFEEK

RESPONDENTS:
----

1. **UNION OF INDIA**
   REP. BY SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT
   FINANCE DEPARTMENT, NEW DELHI.

2. **THE GENERAL MANAGER (HRD)**
   CENTRAL BANK OF INDIA, CENTRAL OFFICE
   CHANDER MUGHI, NARIMAN POINT, MUMBAI.

BY ADV. SRI.DEVAN RAMACHANDRAN - R2
SMT.T.G.SEETHAL
SRI.P.PARAMESWARAN NAIR , A.S.G.

THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 21/11/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:

V.GIRI,J.

W.P (C) No. 31289 of 2007

Dated this the 21st November, 2007

J U D G M E N T

The petitioner is a physically handicapped person. By Exhibit-P1notification issued by the 2nd respondent, applications were invited to the post of Probationary Officers. Exhibit-P1 shows that total number of vacancies to the post of Probationary Officers are 800. It is contended that in Exhibit-P3 the number of vacancies is arbitrarily and illegally reduced. Clause 9 of Exhibit-P1 states that selection will be on the basis of written test and /or Group Discussions, interview depending upon the number of applications received for each post. Merely specifying the eligibility norms, it does not enable a candidate to be called for interview/personal discussion/interview. Apparently a list of eligible candidates was published and the petitioner was included therein. The petitioner approached this Court seeking a direction to the 2nd respondent to publish the list of candidates against notified vacancies. The petitioner contends that if the list of 800 persons is published then he would also included in such list.

Learned Standing Counsel for the Bank, on instructions, submits that petitioner did not qualify the written test and

interview. The petitioner was qualified in the written test and he was called for the interview as the marks obtained by him were not sufficient for being included in the list of eligible candidates. The Bank had limited the number of vacancies to 192. Taking note of the current requirement of the Bank, the petitioner cannot compel the Bank to necessarily publish the list of 800 persons merely because 800 vacancies were provisionally notified. The only question was whether the petitioner was eligible. Candidates in the open market cannot insist that the Bank should necessarily publish the list of 800 persons merely because 800 vacancies were provisionally notified therein. The selection process is not the subject matter of this writ petition. I do not find any in infirmity or illegality in the stand taken by the Bank.

The writ petition is bereft of any merit and the same is therefore, dismissed.

(V.GIRI, JUDGE)

ma

K.THANKAPPAN,J

CRL.A. NO.92 OF 1999

ORDER

25th May, 2007